

### REMARKS

In response to the Action under *Ex parte Quayle* dated June 14, 2010 (the “Quayle Action”) in the above-identified patent application, please consider the following.

#### Quayle Action:

According to the Quayle Action, the application is in condition for allowance except for the presence of claims drawn to a non-elected invention, detailed below. (Action, p. 2). Therefore, Applicant has filed the present paper to cancel those claims without prejudice or disclaimer. Consequently, following entry of this amendment, the present application should be in full and immediate condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

#### Claim Status:

Claims 7, 34, and 35 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Under the imposition of a previous Restriction Requirement, claims 2, 12-15, 17-25, 36, 37, 42-46, and 50-54 were withdrawn from consideration.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, which is now allowed. Accordingly, claim 2 is rejoined and should be allowed. MPEP § 821.04.

Accordingly, the Quayle Action requests the cancellation of the other non-elected claims, i.e., claims 12-15, 17-25, 36, 37, 42-46, and 50-54. These claims have been cancelled in the present paper without prejudice or disclaimer.

The remaining allowed claims are 1-6, 8-11, 16, 26-33, 38-41, 47-49 and 55-59.

Conclusion:

In view of the preceding arguments, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action. However, Applicant reserves the right to set forth further arguments in future papers supporting the patentability of any of the claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.

Throughout the prosecution of this application, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment in the Office Action does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Further, for any instances in which the Examiner may wish to take Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicants expressly do not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully request that the Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: 12 August 2010

/Steven L. Nichols/  
Steven L. Nichols  
Registration No. 40,326

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.  
**Vancott, Bagley, Cornwall & McCarthy**  
36 South State Street  
Suite 1900  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

(801) 237-0251 (phone)  
(801) 237-0866 (fax)